

Applicant : Melvin J. Guiles  
Serial No. : 10/772,607  
Page No. : 6

### REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the above identified patent application. Claims 14-18, 20-21, and 23-26 remain in the application. Claims 14, 17, 20, and 21 are amended to more particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter that Applicant regards as the invention. Claims 23-26 are withdrawn subject to the allowance of a generic claim. Claims 1-13, 19, and 22 are canceled. Applicant traverses the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103 as applied to the amended claims.

#### I. Specification

The specification is amended at page 4, lines 16 and 19, to expressly state that the lateral edges 26 engage or abut the web 20. The amendment is supported by the drawings and provides literal support for the amended claims.

#### II. Invention Summary

The present invention is directed to a vehicle doorbeam having a relatively low profile and a relatively high strength. The doorbeam is fabricated from a web, and includes a beam portion and two bracket portions extending from opposite ends of the beam portion. As defined in amended independent claims 14 and 17, the beam portion includes first and second lateral portions of the web rolled inwardly into closed configurations. As shown in Fig. 2, the first lateral edge abuts the web and is connected to the web along its longitudinal extent. The second lateral edge abuts the web and is also connected to the web along its longitudinal extent.

Applicant : Melvin J. Guiles  
Serial No. : 10/772,607  
Page No. : 7

### III. Section 103 Rejection

As originally presented, claims 14-18 and 20-21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 5,934,544 to Lee in view of U.S. Patent 6,591,577 to Goto.

Lee discloses an automotive bumper beam made by roll forming. The bumper includes a beam portion having first and second lateral portions. The first and second lateral portions are bent at right angles into flanges 60, 62. The lateral portions are rolled closed so that the flanges overlie the web. The lateral edges extend parallel to the web and do not abut the web. The lateral portions may be connected to one another, but are not connected to the web.

Goto discloses a roll formed doorbeam with lateral portions that are rolled into first and second closed configurations 6,6. Like Lee, the first and second lateral portions are bent at right angles into flanges 7,7 so that the flanges overlie the web and the lateral edges do not abut the web. The flanges 7,7 overlap each other, and are connected to the web by a single weld line extending through both of the flanges and the web along the longitudinal length of the web.

Applicants respectfully submit that neither Lee nor Goto, alone or in combination, teaches or suggests the subject matter of amended independent claims 14 and 17. Both Goto and Lee teach that the lateral portions are bent into flanges that overlie the web. The flanges of Goto are overlapped and attached to the web. The flanges of Lee may be attached to one another, but are not attached to the web. The flanges of Goto and Lee add profile to the beam and add extra

Applicant : Melvin J. Guiles  
Serial No. : 10/772,607  
Page No. : 8

steps to the roll forming process. In sharp contrast to Lee and Goto, the present invention includes lateral edges that abut the web.

In support of the patentability of the present invention, enclosed are the Declaration of Sai Gadam and the Declaration of Melvin J. Guiles. The Gadam Declaration provides information regarding the finite element analysis (FEA) of a variety of actual and hypothetical doorbeams, including that of the present invention and those of the prior art. The Guiles Declaration opines on the impracticality of manufacturing the prior art doorbeams using the preferred material of the present invention, which means that the FEA modeling shows the prior art doorbeams in the best possible (perhaps impossible) light.

First, the present beam, the Lee beam, and the Goto beam were modeled using the same material, the same material properties, and the same thickness (1.76 millimeters) for all three beams. The analysis simulated the performance of the beams in response to real-life loads, such as those encountered in an automobile accident. The analysis calculated the load required to deflect the center of each beam, for example, as would occur in a perpendicular side impact. The loads required to deflect the center of each beam 170 millimeters (mm) were 17 (kilo-Newtons) kN for the present beam, 13.2 kN for the Lee beam, and 15.1 kN for the Goto beam. Consequently, the present beam provides superior performance to both of the prior art beams when modeled at the same thickness.

Second, the present beam, the Lee beam, and the Goto beam were modeled using the same material, the same material properties, and the same weight. This modeling was performed in recognition of the importance of a beam's weight to its commercial desirability.

Applicant : Melvin J. Guiles  
Serial No. : 10/772,607  
Page No. : 9

For example, automobile manufacturers typically prefer lower weight components to higher weight components, so long as the lower weight component satisfies the relevant specifications. At equal weights, the present invention is 1.76 mm thick; the Lee beam is 1.4 mm thick; and the Goto beam is 1.6 mm thick. The loads required to deflect the center of each beam 170 mm were 17 kN for the present beam, 13 for the Lee beam, and 12.9 for the Goto beam. Consequently, the present beam provides superior performance to both of the prior art beams when modeled at the same weight.

Third, the Lee beam was modeled to include weld lines between the flanges and the base of the doorbeam. The load required to deflect the center of the Lee beam 170 mm was 15.1 kN. Consequently, the present beam provides superior performance of a hypothetical Lee beam enhanced by the inclusion of weld lines.

In summary, the FEA established the superior performance of the present beam 1) when the beams have the same thickness, 2) when the beams have the same weight, and 3) even when the Lee beam is hypothetically enhanced to include weld lines.

The present beam is capable of being manufactured from higher tensile strength materials than the Goto and Lee beams. As explained in the Guiles Declaration of Melvin J. Guiles, the Director of Technology and Advanced Engineering of the assignee, the higher tensile strength a material has, the more difficult it is to bend and shape the material. In particular, it is more difficult to bend tight radii with high tensile strength materials than with materials of lower tensile strength. The beams disclosed by Goto and Lee both require bending flanges at the lateral edges of the beams that will abut the central portion of the beam. These flanges require bending

Applicant : Melvin J. Guiles  
Serial No. : 10/772,607  
Page No. : 10

approximately square corners in the material, which significantly limits the tensile strength of the materials that can be used for these beams. In fact, Mr. Guiles states that it would not be possible to form the Goto and Lee beams from the high strength material (Martensite M220) that is preferably used in forming the Shape doorbeam without significantly reducing the material thickness, and therefore the strength, of the Goto and Lee beams relative to the Shape beam. Therefore, in modeling the Lee and Goto doorbeams using the same materials, material properties, and material thickness as for the present invention, the Lee and Goto beams were shown in the most favorable light -- and according to Mr. Guiles an impossibly favorable light.

The Gadam and Guiles Declarations, presenting evidence of greater than expected results, are probative evidence of nonobviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103. MPEP 716.02(a) (Feb. 2003).

In view the foregoing remarks and the enclosed declarations, it is respectfully submitted that the cited references do not disclose, teach, or suggest the subject matter of the amended claims. It is therefore respectfully submitted that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103 is unfounded or overcome, and therefore should be withdrawn.

#### IV. Dependent Claims

Dependent claims 15-16, 18, and 20-21 depend from amended claims 14 and 17 and are therefore even more clearly allowable. Claims 16 and 21 further recite that the first and second lateral portions are connected to one another along a line separate from the first and second lateral edges. The Examiner asserts that Goto discloses this concept, however, Goto only discloses a single weld line that connects the flanges to the web. Goto does not disclose first and

Applicant : Melvin J. Guiles  
Serial No. : 10/772,607  
Page No. : 11

second lateral edges welded to the web, in addition to the first and second lateral portions connected together along a line separate from the first line. Claim 15 further recites the first and second lateral portions of similar size and shape. Claim 18 further recites that the beam portion and the bracket portions are a single unitary piece. Claim 20 further recites that the beam portion includes a lateral center portion, and that the first and second lateral edges abut the piece at the lateral center portion.


V. Conclusion

In view of the above amendments, the enclosed declarations, and these remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that the present application is in condition for allowance. A notice to that effect is earnestly and respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

MELVIN J. GUILLES

By: Warner Norcross & Judd LLP

  
Charles E. Burpee  
Registration No. 29 776  
900 Fifth Third Center  
111 Lyon Street, N.W.  
Grand Rapids, MI 49503-2487  
(616) 752-2141